

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 124-126, 129 and 135-138 are pending in this application and stand rejected on various grounds. Rejections to the pending claims are respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(f)

Claims 124-126, 129, 135 and 137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) because the Applicant allegedly did not invent the claimed subject matter.

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of this rejection since Applicants provide Exhibit A of Dr. Wood's Declaration and their arguments below.

Arguments

Conception is the "formation in the mind of the inventor, of a **definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention**, as it is hereafter to be applied in practice."

Hitzeman v. Rutter, 243 F.3d 1345, 58 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Emphasis added).

Applicants submit that they were the first to conceive the novel, "complete" DNA sequence encoding PRO1186. Applicants submit that in this instance, the prior art, the Incyte EST 3476792 sequence, only disclosed an incomplete DNA sequence with partial identity to the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 370, disclosed and claimed in the present application.

Even though Applicants submitted a Declaration by Dr. William Wood in their amendment dated September 30, 2006, they inadvertently omitted to include Exhibit A which formed part of the Declaration. Applicants apologize for this omission and hereby enclose a new copy of the Declaration by Dr. William Wood **with Exhibit A** for the Examiner's review. Exhibit A shows an alignment between the Incyte EST 3476792 DNA sequence (upper line throughout the alignment) and DNA56748.init, which is the initial DNA cluster of interest identified by Dr. Wood and his group. The alignment with other sequences like 2813596 and 1549832 in Exhibit A are not relevant here. DNA56748 was later designated as DNA60621, as will be explained in detail below and in Dr. Wood's Declaration.

Dr. Wood explains in his Declaration that while the Incyte EST sequence (EST 3476792) was used for identifying the coding sequence of PRO1186, the Incyte EST sequence did not code for the full-length PRO1186 polypeptide, since it truncated prematurely before the nucleotide

encoding for the stop codon. This is evident from the alignment between the Incyte EST 3476792 DNA sequence (upper line throughout the alignment) and DNA56748.init in Exhibit A. In other words, even if it had been known that the Incyte EST sequence was a coding sequence, as it was not, it would only have encoded for a truncated polypeptide of PRO1186, and not the full-length PRO1186. Applicants submit that they used their own knowledge of the extracellular domain sequence of PRO1186 (ECD), clustering analysis, extension of DNA sequences and PCR-based cDNA library screening to obtain the full-length nucleic acid sequence encoding for the PRO1186 polypeptide, and designated this novel DNA (*i.e.*, the DNA56748 cluster) as DNA60621 (also see last line of paragraph 6 of Dr. Wood's Declaration. DNA60621 is also referred to as DNA60621-1516 or SEQ ID NO: 370 in the specification and is the sequence shown in Figure 265).

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Incyte did not possess or reduce to practice a "complete" DNA sequence identical to the instantly claimed DNA of SEQ ID NO: 390 encoding for the PRO1186 polypeptide. Therefore, the instant invention is not anticipated by the Incyte EST 3476792 sequence. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, one of skill in the art would not have been able to make a polynucleotide comprising the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 370 or its encoding amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 371 without first having realized that EST 3476792 was part of a coding sequence, and or without extending the EST 3476792 sequence, an act which would have required additional knowledge about the protein sequence to be used for the DNA extension, prior knowledge like PRO1186's extracellular domain, for instance. Such knowledge was not provided by Incyte (who did not disclose or reduce to practice the encoded polypeptide or the encoding nucleic acid) around the effective filing date of the instant application. Hence, Applicants submit that the instantly claimed subject matter could not have been derived from the Incyte EST 3476792 sequence alone without significant work by the Applicants which would contribute towards "conception, completion and operation" of the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant invention was not anticipated by the disclosure of the Incyte EST 3476792 sequence and therefore request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 124-126, 129, 135-138 remain provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 13-25 of copending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/692,299.

In view of the presentation of a corrected Declaration by Dr. Wood with Exhibit A, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and be held in abeyance until there is an indication of allowable subject matter in either of these cases.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in *prima facie* condition for allowance, and an early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **08-1641** (referencing Attorney's Docket No. **39780-2730 P1C65**).

Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2006

By: Daphne Reddy
Daphne Reddy (Reg. No. 53,507)

HELLER EHRMAN, LLP
275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, California 94025
Telephone: (650) 324-7000
Facsimile: (650) 324-0638

SV 2190898 v1
3/10/06 9:58 AM (39780.2730)